arXiv:1007.2373v2 [math-ph] 25 Jul 2010

"Sixth root of unity" and Feynman diagrams: hypergeometric function approach point of view

M.Yu. Kalmykov[a] B.A. Kniehl[a]

[a] II. Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg,
Luruper Chaussee 149, 22761 Hamburg, Germany

We briefly discuss the transcendental constants generated through the ε expansion of generalized hypergeometric functions and their interrelation with the "sixth root of unity."

1. After the appearance of the proof of the theorem concerning the calculability of 4-loop renormalization group (RG) functions in the framework of dimensional regularization [1] in arbitrary renormalizable models in terms of ζ functions [2] and the explicit evaluation of some 4- and 5-loop RG functions [3], quite intriguing results were derived by Broadhurst [4], who had observed the appearance of non-zeta terms in the higher-order terms of the ε expansion of the two-loop massless propagator diagram. Later, this observation was clearly explained in the framework of the knot approach to Feynman diagrams [5], and all new transcendentals were parametrized in terms of multiple zeta values: $\zeta_{\vec{s}} = \sum_{n_1>n_2>\ldots>n_k>0} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{n_j^{s_j}}$. This result was extended to the case of the 2-loop massless propagator diagram in [6] and was recently fully analyzed in [7]. In particular, it was shown that the ε expansions of 4-loop non-planar massless diagrams may generate transcendentals expressible in terms of multiple polylogarithms of the "sixth root of unity." All recent results for the first few coefficients of the ε expansions of massless propagator diagrams [8] are in full agreement with this theorem. Let us recall that the appearance in Feynman diagrams of transcendental constants related to the "sixth root of unity" by $\sum_{n_1>n_2>\ldots>n_k>0} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\left(e^{i\pi/3}\right)^{p_j n_j}}{n_j^{s_j}}$, where $p_j \in \{0,1,\cdots,5\}$, were predicted by Broadhurst in [9] in the context of the study of the finite parts of massive three-loop bubble diagrams. The lowest-weight Broadhurst bases include the following elements: $\pi^i \ln^j 2 \ln^k 3$, $\mathrm{Cl}_2\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right) \pi^i \ln^j 2 \ln^k 3$, $\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \pi^i \ln^j 2 \ln^k 3$, etc., where i,j,k are integers (in [9] only constants up to weight **3** were presented). Based on the existing partial results [10], the authors of [11] pointed out that, in real physical diagrams with two massive cuts only, the modified set of transcendental constants differ as follows: (i) the factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ should be present (for example, $\pi, \ln 2, \ln 3$ of [9] should be $\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}, \ln 3$ as in [11]); (ii) all elements are generated by values of $\mathrm{Li}_a\left(\exp\{i\theta_k\}\right)$ and $S_{a,b}(\exp\{i\theta_k\})$, where

$$\theta_k = \frac{\pi}{3} k \; , \quad k = 1, 2 \; , \tag{1}$$

and $\mathrm{Li}_a(z)$ and $S_{a,b}(z)$ are the classical and Nielsen polylogarithms, respectively; (iii) the additional statement that these constants should form an algebra. This construction is in full agreement with the all-order ε expansions of the Feynman diagrams considered in [12]. In [13], this set of constants was extended up to weight **5**, and it was shown that new transcendentals are generated (χ_5 in the notation of [13]) which are not expressible in terms of Nielsen polylogarithms. Furthermore, the appearance of the factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ only receives a strong explanation in [14,15,16]. This factor comes from (i) the evaluation of a special type of multiple sums and/or (ii) the structures of the coefficients of the all-order ε expansions of basic hypergeometric functions. In fact, we have[1] reads:

---

[1] The structures of other types of sums and/or hypergeometric functions were discussed in [16,17,18].

$$F\left(\begin{array}{c}\{1+a_i\varepsilon\}^{P}\\ \frac{3}{2}+f\varepsilon,\ \{1+e_i\varepsilon\}^{P-2}\end{array}\middle|\,z\right)=\frac{(1+2f\varepsilon)}{2z}$$
$$\times\frac{1-y}{1+y}\left[\ln y+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\varepsilon^k\tilde{\tilde{\tilde{\Phi}}}_{k+1}(y)\right]\ ,$$
$$F\left(\begin{array}{c}\{1+a_i\varepsilon\}^{R+2},\ \{2+d_i\varepsilon\}^{P-2-R}\\ \frac{3}{2}+f\varepsilon,\ \{1+e_i\varepsilon\}^{R},\{2+c_i\varepsilon\}^{P-2-R}\end{array}\middle|\,z\right)$$
$$=\frac{(1+2f\varepsilon)}{2z}\Pi_{s=1}^{P-2-R}\frac{(1+c_s\varepsilon)}{(1+d_s\varepsilon)}\qquad(2)$$
$$\left\{\frac{1-y}{1+y}\left[\ln y+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\varepsilon^k\Phi_{k+1}(y)\right]+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\varepsilon^k\tilde{\Phi}_{k+1}(y)\right\}\ ,$$
$$F\left(\begin{array}{c}\{1+a_i\varepsilon\}^{K+3},\ \{2+d_i\varepsilon\}^{P-3-K}\\ \frac{3}{2}+f\varepsilon,\ \{1+e_i\varepsilon\}^{K-L},\{2+c_i\varepsilon\}^{P-2-K+L}\end{array}\middle|\,z\right)$$
$$=\frac{(1+2f\varepsilon)}{2z}\frac{\Pi_{s=1}^{P-2-K+L}(1+c_s\varepsilon)}{\Pi_{s=1}^{P-3-K}(1+d_s\varepsilon)}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\varepsilon^k\tilde{\tilde{\Phi}}_{L+2+k}(y),\qquad(3)$$

where F is the hypergeometric function ${}_PF_{P-1}$, R, K and L are integers with $0\leq R\leq P-2$, $0\leq K\leq P-3$, $0\leq L\leq K$, the superscripts R and $K-L$ indicate the lengths of the parameter lists, $y=\frac{1-\sqrt{\frac{z}{z-1}}}{1+\sqrt{\frac{z}{z-1}}}$, and $\Phi_k(y),\tilde{\Phi}_k(y),\tilde{\tilde{\Phi}}_k(y)$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\tilde{\Phi}}}_{k+1}(y)$ are linear combinations of multiple polylogarithms of the square root of unity [19] of weight **k**,

$$\Phi_k(y)\quad=\quad\sum_{\vec{s},j}c_{\vec{s},k}\ln^j(y)\left[\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\vec{\sigma}\\ \vec{s}\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(\pm y)-\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\vec{\sigma}\\ \vec{s}\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(\pm 1)\right]\ .\qquad(4)$$

Here, $c_{\vec{s},k}$ are numerical coefficients, $\vec{s}=(s_1,\cdots s_n)$ and $\vec{\sigma}=(\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_n)$ are multi-indices, $\sigma_k=\pm1$ are the square roots of unity, $j+s_1+\cdots+s_n=k$, and we have used the definition:

$$\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_k\\ s_1,\cdots,s_n\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(z)=\sum_{m_1>\cdots m_n>0}\frac{z^{m_1}\sigma_1^{m_1}\cdots\sigma_n^{m_n}}{m_1^{s_1}m_2^{s_2}\cdots m_n^{s_n}}\ .$$

The r.h.s. of Eq. (4) corresponds to the Remiddi-Vermaseren functions [20]. The differential-reduction algorithm [15,21,22] allows us to write the expansions for arbitrary values of parameters, as

$$Q(z)\,{}_PF_{P-1}\left(\begin{array}{c}\{I_i+a_i\varepsilon\}^{P}\\ L+\frac{1}{2}+f\varepsilon,\ \{K_i+e_i\varepsilon\}^{P-2}\end{array}\middle|\,z\right)$$
$$=\sum R_i(z)[\text{Eq. (3)}]+\sum S_i(z)[\text{Eq. (3)}]\ ,\qquad(5)$$

where $Q(z)$, $R_i(z)$ and $S_i(z)$ are polynomials and I_i, K_i and L are integers. For two-cut diagrams with massive lines, the on-mass-shell case corresponds to $z=1/4$, so that $y=\exp(\pm i\pi/3)$, $-y=\exp(\mp i2\pi/3)$ and $\frac{1-y}{1+y}=\mp\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}$, and the ε expansions of Eqs. (3) and (3) have the structures $\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\varepsilon^j\Phi_{j+1}(\pm\theta_k)$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\varepsilon^j\tilde{\Phi}_{L+1+j}(\pm\theta_k)$, respectively, where $\Phi_j(z)$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_j(z)$ are defined by Eq. (4), and θ_k by Eq. (1).

2. From the all-order ε expansions of the hypergeometric functions constructed in [16], the following set of constants are generated at weight **k**:
(i) The Remiddi-Vermaseren functions evaluated with arguments θ_k defined by Eq. (1),

$$\sum_{\vec{s},j}(i\pi)^j\left[\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\vec{\sigma}\\ \vec{s}\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(\pm\theta_k)-\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\vec{\sigma}\\ \vec{s}\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(\pm1)\right]\ .\qquad(6)$$

This is a subset of the "sixth root of unity" [9], which, up to weight **4**, agrees with [11] and, at weight **5**, with [13]. (ii) The product of Remiddi-Vermaseren functions, with arguments θ_k defined by Eq. (1), multiplied by $i/\sqrt{3}$,

$$\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}\sum_{\vec{s},j}(i\pi)^j\left[\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\vec{\sigma}\\ \vec{s}\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(\pm\theta_k)-\mathrm{Li}_{\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\vec{\sigma}\\ \vec{s}\end{smallmatrix}\right)}(\pm1)\right]\ .\qquad(7)$$

Up to weights **4** and **5**, these results agree with [11] and [13], respectively. This explains the mysterious generation of the factor $1/\sqrt{3}$.

The product of hypergeometric functions can be understood as the product of low-loop master integrals (the 2-loop propagator diagram may generate the product of two 1-loop self-energies). The appearance of diagrams of this type gives rise exactly to the product of two basis elements described in [11].

For practical applications in the PSLQ analysis [23], it is desirable to have a minimal set of constants corresponding to Eqs. (6) and (7). Their special subclass, Euler-Zagier sums, was analyzed in [24]. For the other constants, the solution is not unique, since the commonly accepted parametrizations of the real and imaginary parts of the Remiddi-Vermaseren functions[2] with argument $z = \exp(i\phi)$ do not exist. For example, starting from weight **3**, the *inverse binomial sums*, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\binom{2j}{j}} \frac{1}{j^c}$, can be written (for details, see [13,26,27,28]) in terms of either Dirichlet's L series, the derivatives of Ψ functions, generalized log-sin functions [28], Nielsen polylogarithms [26,13] or generalized polylogarithms. Let us recall that the classical polylogarithms with these arguments produce the Clausen functions $\mathrm{Cl}_j(\theta)$ [29], while the Nielsen polylogarithms produce the generalized log-sine functions $\mathrm{Ls}_a^{(k)}(\theta)$ only [13,26,29,30,31]. For the parametrizations of Remiddi-Vermaseren functions with complex unit, $\mathrm{Lsc}_{a,b}(\theta)$ and $\mathrm{LsLsc}_{a,b,c}(\theta)$ functions were introduced in [14,30,32].

3. The ε expansions of hypergeometric functions entering the r.h.s. of Eqs.(3) and (3) may be written in terms of *multiple inverse binomial sums* [13,14,26,28] defined as

$$\Sigma_{a_1,\ldots,a_p;\, b_1,\ldots,b_q;c} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{S_{a_1}\ldots S_{a_p}\Lambda_{b_1}\ldots\Lambda_{b_q}}{\binom{2j}{j} j^c} \, , \quad (8)$$

where S_a and $\bar{S}_b$ stand for $S_a(j-1)$ and $S_b(2j-1)$, respectively, $S_k(j) = \sum_{l=1}^{j} l^{-k}$ are the harmonic sums and Λ_a denotes the following linear combinations of $\bar{S}_a$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^k \bar{S}_k\right) = 1 + \varepsilon\bar{S}_1 + \varepsilon^2\left[\bar{S}_2 + \bar{S}_1^2\right] \\ &+\varepsilon^3\left[\bar{S}_1{}^3 + 3\bar{S}_1\bar{S}_2 + 2\bar{S}_3\right] \\ &+\varepsilon^4\left[\bar{S}_1{}^4 + 6\bar{S}_1^2\bar{S}_2 + 3\bar{S}_2^2 + 8\bar{S}_1\bar{S}_3 + 6\bar{S}_4\right] + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^5) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j \Lambda_j \, . \end{aligned}$$

Here, all rational factors coming from the series expansion of the exponent are equal to 1. For the hypergeometric functions of Eq.(3), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Omega_r^{(K)}}{\binom{2j}{j} j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{r=1}^{m_\omega} c_r \omega_r^{(K+1)} \, , \quad (9)$$

where c_r are rational numbers, $\Omega_r^{(K)}$ are products of the harmonic sums S_a and Λ_b, namely

$$\begin{aligned} &\Omega_r^{(0)} = 1 \, , \quad \Omega_r^{(1)} \in \{S_1, \Lambda_1\} \, , \\ &\Omega_r^{(2)} \in \{S_2, S_1^2, S_1\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2\} \, , \\ &\Omega_r^{(3)} \in \{S_3, S_1S_2, S_1^3, S_2\Lambda_1, S_1^2\Lambda_1, S_1\Lambda_2, \Lambda_3\} \, , \\ &\Omega_r^{(4)} \in \{S_4, S_1S_3, S_2^2, S_1^2S_2, S_1^4, \Lambda_4, S_1\Lambda_3, \\ &\qquad S_2\Lambda_2, S_1^2\Lambda_2, S_1^3\Lambda_1, S_1S_2\Lambda_1, S_3\Lambda_1\} \, , \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and $\omega_r^{(K)}$ belong to sets of transcendental constants, namely

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega_r^{(1)} = \pi \, , \quad \omega_r^{(2)} \in \{\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right), \pi\ln 3, \} \, , \\ &\omega_r^{(3)} \in \{C_3, \pi\ln^2 3, \pi\zeta_2\} \, , \\ &\omega_r^{(4)} \in \{C_4, \mathrm{Ls}_4\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right), \pi\zeta_3, \pi\ln^3 3, \zeta_2\omega_r^{(2)}\} \, . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

At weight **5**, there are 10 independent terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1^{(5)} &= C_5 \, , \omega_2^{(5)} = D_1 \, , \quad \omega_3^{(5)} = \mathrm{Ls}_5\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right) \, , \\ \omega_4^{(5)} &= \pi\zeta_4 \, , \ \omega_5^{(5)} = \pi\zeta_3\ln 3 \, , \ \omega_6^{(5)} = \pi\zeta_2\ln^2 3 \, , \\ \omega_7^{(5)} &= \pi\ln^4 3 \, , \quad \omega_8^{(5)} = \pi\left[\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\right]^2 \, , \\ \omega_9^{(5)} &= \zeta_3\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right) \, , \quad \omega_{10}^{(5)} = \zeta_2 C_3 \, , \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathrm{Ls}_j^{(k)}(\theta)$ are generalized log-sine functions defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ls}_j^{(k)}(\theta) &= -\int_0^\theta \mathrm{d}\phi \, \phi^k \ln^{j-k-1}\left|2\sin\tfrac{\phi}{2}\right| \, , \\ \mathrm{Ls}_j(\theta) &= \mathrm{Ls}_j^{(0)}(\theta) \, , \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and C_3, C_4, C_5 and D_1 are combinations of generalized log-sine functions, namely

$$\begin{aligned} C_3 &= 3\mathrm{Ls}_3\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) - 2\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\ln 3 \, , \\ C_4 &= 2\mathrm{Ls}_4\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) - 3\mathrm{Ls}_3\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right)\ln 3 + \mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\ln^2 3 \, , \\ C_5 &= \mathrm{Ls}_5\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) - 2\mathrm{Ls}_4\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right)\ln 3 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2}\mathrm{Ls}_3\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right)\ln^2 3 - \tfrac{1}{3}\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\ln^3 3 \, , \\ D_1 &= 3\mathrm{Ls}_5^{(2)}\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) - 4\pi\mathrm{Ls}_4^{(1)}\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{32}{27}\mathrm{Ls}_4\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\ln 3 + 8\zeta_2\mathrm{Ls}_3\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) \, . \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We wish to mention that the combinations C_3, C_4 and C_5 completely coincide with appropriate terms of the ε expansions of the Gauss hypergeometric functions considered in [12], and the generating function for these combinations is

---

[2] For numerical evaluations of Remiddi-Vermaseren functions, some of the existing programs [25] may be used.

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j C_{j+1} = \frac{3}{2} 3^{-\varepsilon} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2\varepsilon)^j}{j!} \mathrm{Ls}_{j+1}\left(\frac{2}{3}\pi\right) ,$$

so that $C_1 = 0$ and $C_2 = 2\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)$. For the hypergeometric functions of Eq.(3), the ε expansions have the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Omega_k^{(R)}}{\binom{2j}{j} j^{2+r}} = \sum_{s=1}^{L_\sigma} C_s \sigma_s^{(2+r+R)} , \qquad (15)$$

where r is a positive integer, C_s is a rational number and $\sigma_r^{(K)}$ belong to sets of transcendental constants, namely

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_r^{(2)} = \zeta_2 , \quad \sigma_r^{(3)} \in \{\zeta_3, \pi\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\} , \\ &\sigma_r^{(4)} \in \{\pi\mathrm{Ls}_3\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right), \left[\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right)\right]^2, \zeta_4\} . \end{aligned} \qquad (16)$$

At weight **5**, there are only 6 independent constants, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1^{(5)} &= \pi\mathrm{Ls}_4\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right) , \quad \sigma_2^{(5)} = \pi\mathrm{Ls}_4\left(\tfrac{2\pi}{3}\right) , \\ \sigma_3^{(5)} &= \pi\zeta_2\mathrm{Ls}_2\left(\tfrac{\pi}{3}\right) , \quad \sigma_4^{(5)} = \chi_5 , \\ \sigma_5^{(5)} &= \zeta_5 , \quad \sigma_6^{(5)} = \zeta_2\zeta_3 , \end{aligned} \qquad (17)$$

where χ_5 is defined as $\chi_5 \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{S_1^3}{\binom{2j}{j} j^2}$ [13,30]. For illustration, we present here the analytical results for all sums of weight **5**:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{S_4}{j} \right\rangle &= \frac{4}{9}\omega_3^{(5)} + \frac{155}{54}\pi\zeta_4 - \frac{2}{3}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{8}{3}\omega_9^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_2^2}{j} \right\rangle &= \frac{4}{9}\omega_3^{(5)} + \frac{233}{81}\pi\zeta_4 - \frac{2}{3}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{8}{3}\omega_9^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1 S_3}{j} \right\rangle &= -\frac{9}{8}D_1 + \frac{107}{54}\omega_3^{(5)} + \frac{2437}{432}\pi\zeta_4 \\
&\quad + \frac{16}{9}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{2}{9}\omega_8^{(5)} - \frac{14}{9}\omega_9^{(5)} - \frac{1}{3}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1^2 S_2}{j} \right\rangle &= \frac{5}{12}D_1 - \frac{131}{81}\omega_3^{(5)} - \frac{1843}{216}\pi\zeta_4 \\
&\quad - \frac{98}{81}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{1}{27}\omega_6^{(5)} + \frac{14}{27}\omega_8^{(5)} - \frac{68}{27}\omega_9^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{9}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1^4}{j} \right\rangle &= 16C_5 + \frac{23}{2}D_1 - \frac{218}{9}\omega_3^{(5)} + \frac{2837}{108}\pi\zeta_4 \\
&\quad + \frac{716}{27}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{110}{9}\omega_6^{(5)} + \frac{1}{3}\omega_7^{(5)} - \frac{2}{3}\omega_8^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{16}{3}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{4}{3}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1^3 \Lambda_1}{j} \right\rangle &= 19C_5 + \frac{195}{16}D_1 - \frac{2717}{108}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{40093}{864}\pi\zeta_4 + \frac{302}{9}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{89}{6}\omega_6^{(5)} + \frac{1}{3}\omega_7^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{13}{9}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{94}{9}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{5}{3}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1 S_2 \Lambda_1}{j} \right\rangle &= \frac{83}{48}D_1 - \frac{1493}{324}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{50435}{2592}\pi\zeta_4 - \frac{278}{81}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{1}{27}\omega_6^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{17}{27}\omega_8^{(5)} - \frac{74}{27}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{1}{9}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left[\frac{S_3 \Lambda_1}{j} \right\rangle &= -\frac{9}{8}D_1 + \frac{89}{54}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{1855}{432}\pi\zeta_4 + \frac{16}{9}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{11}{9}\omega_8^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{62}{9}\omega_9^{(5)} - \frac{1}{3}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1^2 \Lambda_2}{j} \right\rangle &= 22C_5 + \frac{257}{24}D_1 - \frac{3593}{162}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{102433}{1296}\pi\zeta_4 + \frac{3470}{81}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{482}{27}\omega_6^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3}\omega_7^{(5)} - \frac{56}{27}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{404}{27}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{14}{9}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_2 \Lambda_2}{j} \right\rangle &= \frac{73}{24}D_1 - \frac{1249}{162}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{42319}{1296}\pi\zeta_4 - \frac{458}{81}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{1}{27}\omega_6^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{16}{27}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{136}{27}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{4}{9}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{S_1 \Lambda_3}{j} \right\rangle &= 25C_5 + \frac{61}{8}D_1 - \frac{949}{54}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{16771}{144}\pi\zeta_4 + \frac{1402}{27}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{383}{18}\omega_6^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3}\omega_7^{(5)} - \frac{16}{9}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{124}{9}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{4}{3}\omega_{10}^{(5)} , \\
\left\langle \frac{\Lambda_4}{j} \right\rangle &= 28C_5 + \frac{7}{2}D_1 - \frac{422}{27}\omega_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{5093}{36}\pi\zeta_4 + \frac{1576}{27}\omega_5^{(5)} + \frac{226}{9}\omega_6^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3}\omega_7^{(5)} - \frac{16}{9}\omega_8^{(5)} + \frac{136}{9}\omega_9^{(5)} + \frac{4}{3}\omega_{10}^{(5)} ,
\end{aligned} \qquad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\frac{S_1}{j^4}\right] &= -\frac{28}{81}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{19}{27}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{134}{27}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{\Lambda_1}{j^4}\right] &= -\frac{82}{81}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{46}{27}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{847}{54}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_3}{n^2}\right] &= -\frac{4}{9}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{8}{9}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{58}{9}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_2}{n^3}\right] &= -\frac{4}{27}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{2}{27}\sigma_3^{(5)} + \frac{2}{3}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{29}{27}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_1 S_2}{n^2}\right] &= \frac{20}{243}\sigma_1^{(5)} - \frac{4}{81}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad -\frac{23}{81}\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \frac{53}{81}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_2 \Lambda_1}{n^2}\right] &= \frac{146}{243}\sigma_1^{(5)} - \frac{7}{81}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad -\frac{95}{81}\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \frac{662}{81}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_1^2}{n^3}\right] &= \frac{2}{9}\sigma_1^{(5)} - \frac{1}{2}\chi_5 - \frac{13}{18}\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \frac{47}{18}\zeta_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_1 \Lambda_1}{n^3}\right] &= \frac{277}{324}\sigma_1^{(5)} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2^{(5)} + \frac{23}{108}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{323}{432}\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \frac{1291}{144}\zeta_5 - \frac{11}{16}\chi_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_1^2 \Lambda_1}{n^2}\right] &= -\frac{116}{243}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{2}{3}\sigma_2^{(5)} - \frac{23}{81}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{437}{162}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{529}{162}\zeta_5 + \frac{3}{2}\chi_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{\Lambda_2}{n^3}\right] &= \frac{337}{162}\sigma_1^{(5)} - \sigma_2^{(5)} + \frac{67}{54}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad + \frac{335}{216}\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \frac{6037}{216}\zeta_5 - \frac{7}{8}\chi_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{\Lambda_3}{n^2}\right] &= -\frac{1015}{324}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{7}{2}\sigma_2^{(5)} - \frac{469}{108}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{5633}{432}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{19123}{432}\zeta_5 + \frac{49}{16}\chi_5 \ , \\
\left[\frac{S_1 \Lambda_2}{n^2}\right] &= -\frac{517}{324}\sigma_1^{(5)} + \frac{11}{6}\sigma_2^{(5)} - \frac{143}{108}\sigma_3^{(5)} \\
&\quad - \frac{3059}{432}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{7049}{432}\zeta_5 + \frac{35}{16}\chi_5 \ , \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle X \rangle = \sqrt{3}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\binom{2j}{j}} X$, $[X] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\binom{2j}{j}} X$ and C_5, D_1, $\omega_r^{(5)}$ and $\sigma_r^{(5)}$ are defined by Eqs. (12), (14) and (17).

4. Based on the recently established analytical structures of the coefficients of the all-order ε expansions of hypergeometric functions, indicated by Eqs. (3), (3) and (5), we presented in Eqs. (11), (12), (16) and (17) the set of linearly independent transcendental constants generated by single-scale massive Feynman diagrams with two massive cuts in $4-2\varepsilon$ dimensions. The main difference between these two sets is the factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$, which was predicted in [11]. We mention that the first set, given in Eqs. (11) and (12), does not form an algebra: $\omega_r^{(a)} \times \omega_r^{(b)} \neq \omega_r^{(a+b)}$. On the other hand, the second set, given in Eqs. (16) and (17), does form an algebra. Changing the space-time dimension or considering Feynman diagrams related to hypergeometric functions of a few variables or with a more complicated combination of massive and massless cuts generates another set of constants, as may be seen, for example, in [30,32,33].

Acknowledgments. MYK would like to thank the organizers of the conference *Loops and Legs in Quantum Field Theory* for the invitation and for creating such a stimulating atmosphere. We are grateful to Z. Merebashvili for carefully reading this manuscript. This research was supported in part by BMBF Grant No. 05 HT6GUA, by DFG Grants No. KN 365/3–1 and KN 365/3–2, and by HGF Grant No. HA 101.

REFERENCES

1. G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **44** (1972) 189.
2. F.V. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. B **100** (1981) 65; K.G. Chetyrkin and F.V. Tkachov, Nucl. Phys. B **192** (1981) 159.
3. K.G. Chetyrkin, A.L. Kataev and F.V. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. B **85** (1979) 277; D.I. Kazakov, O.V. Tarasov and A.A. Vladimirov, Sov. Phys. JETP **50** (1979) 521; O.V. Tarasov, A.A. Vladimirov and A.Y. Zharkov, Phys. Lett. B **93** (1980) 429; D.I. Kazakov, Phys. Lett. B **133** (1983) 406; Theor. Math. Phys. **58** (1984) 223; **62** (1985) 84; H. Kleinert et al., Phys. Lett. B **272** (1991) 39; Phys. Lett. B **319** (1993) 545(E).
4. D.J. Broadhurst, Z. Phys. C **32** (1986) 249.
5. D.J. Broadhurst and D. Kreimer, Int. J. Mod.

Phys. C **6** (1995) 519; Phys. Lett. B **393** (1997) 403.

6. I. Bierenbaum and S. Weinzierl, Eur. Phys. J. C **32** (2003) 67.
7. F. Brown, Commun. Math. Phys. **287** (2009) 925; arXiv:0910.0114.
8. P.A. Baikov and K.G. Chetyrkin, Nucl. Phys. B **837** (2010) 186; R.N. Lee, A.V. Smirnov and V.A. Smirnov, arXiv:1005.0362.
9. D.J. Broadhurst, Eur. Phys. J. C **8** (1999) 311.
10. J. van der Bij and M.J.G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **231** (1984) 205; D.J. Broadhurst, Z. Phys. C **47** (1990) 115; E.E. Boos and A.I. Davydychev, Theor. Math. Phys. **89** (1991) 1052; D.J. Broadhurst, J. Fleischer and O.V. Tarasov, Z. Phys. C **60** (1993) 287; N.I. Usyukina and A.I. Davydychev, Phys. Lett. B **332** (1994) 159; A.I. Davydychev and J.B. Tausk, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 7381; A.I. Davydychev, arXiv:hep-th/9908032; J. Fleischer, M.Yu. Kalmykov and A.V. Kotikov, Phys. Lett. B **462** (1999) 169; **467** (1999) 310(E).
11. J. Fleischer and M.Yu. Kalmykov, Phys. Lett. B **470** (1999) 168.
12. A.I. Davydychev, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 087701.
13. A.I. Davydychev and M.Yu. Kalmykov, Nucl. Phys. B **605** (2001) 266.
14. A.I. Davydychev and M.Yu. Kalmykov, Nucl. Phys. B **699** (2004) 3.
15. M.Yu. Kalmykov, JHEP **04** (2006) 056.
16. M.Yu. Kalmykov, B.F.L. Ward and S. Yost, JHEP **02** (2007) 040; **10** (2007) 048; M.Yu. Kalmykov and B.A. Kniehl, Nucl. Phys. B **809** (2009) 365; arXiv:1003.1965.
17. F. Jegerlehner, M.Yu. Kalmykov and O. Veretin, Nucl. Phys. B **658** (2003) 49.
18. S. Moch, P. Uwer and S. Weinzierl, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 3363; S. Weinzierl, J. Math. Phys. **45** (2004) 2656; M.Yu. Kalmykov, B.F.L. Ward and S.A. Yost, JHEP **11** (2007) 009; T. Huber and D. Maître, Comput. Phys. Commun. **178** (2008) 755.
19. A.B. Goncharov, Math. Res. Lett. **4** (1997) 617; **5** (1998) 497.
20. E. Remiddi and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15** (2000) 725.
21. N. Takayama, Japan J. Appl. Math. **6** (1989) 147; J. Symbolic Comput. **20** (1995) 637. M.Yu. Kalmykov et al., arXiv:0901.4716.
22. V.V.Bytev, M.Yu.Kalmykov and B.A.Kniehl, Nucl. Phys. B **836** (2010) 129.
23. H.R.P. Ferguson, D.H. Bailey, S. Arno, Math. Comp. **68** (1999) 351.
24. D.J. Broadhurst, arXiv:hep-th/9604128; J.M. Borwein et al., Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **353** (2001) 907; M. Bigotte et al., Theoret. Comput. Sci. **273** (2002) 271; J. Blümlein, D.J. Broadhurst and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Comput. Phys. Commun. **181** (2010) 582.
25. J. Vollinga and S. Weinzierl, Comput. Phys. Commun. **167** (2005) 177; D. Maître, arXiv:hep-ph/0703052.
26. A.I. Davydychev and M.Yu. Kalmykov, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **89** (2000) 283.
27. A. van der Poorten, The Math. Intelligencer **1** (1979) 195; I.J. Zucker, J. Number Theory **20** (1985) 92; D.H. Lehmer, Amer. Math. Monthly **92** (1985) 449; D.G.C. McKeon and A. Kotikov, Can. J. Phys. **72** (1994) 250; **72** (1994) 714(E); Z. Nan-Yue and K.S. Williams, Pacific J. Math. **168** (1995) 271; J. Fleischer, A.V. Kotikov and O.L. Veretin, Nucl. Phys. B **547** (1999) 343; J.M. Borwein, D.J. Broadhurst and J. Kamnitzer, Exper. Math. **10** (2001) 25; N. Batir, Appl. Math. Comput. **147** (2004) 645; M.Yu. Kalmykov, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **135** (2004) 280; J. Borwein and M. Chamberland, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. **2007** Art. ID 19381; W. Chu and D. Zheng, Int. J. Number Theory **5** (2009) 429; R.J. Mathar, arXiv:0905.0215; D.F. Connon, arXiv:1005.2730.
28. M.Yu. Kalmykov and O. Veretin, Phys. Lett. B **483** (2000) 315.
29. L. Lewin, *Polylogarithms and associated functions* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981).
30. A.I. Davydychev and M.Yu. Kalmykov, arXiv:hep-th/0203212.
31. M.Yu. Kalmykov and A. Sheplyakov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **172** (2005) 45.
32. M.Yu. Kalmykov, Nucl. Phys. B **718** (2005) 276.

33. M. Strosser, S.A. Larin and V. Dohm, Nucl. Phys. B **540** (1999) 654; A. Frink et al., Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 4548; M.Y. Kalmykov et al., arXiv:0810.3238; T. Huber, JHEP **0903** (2009) 024; V. Del Duca, C. Duhr and V.A. Smirnov, JHEP **1005** (2010) 084; R. Bonciani, G. Degrassi and A. Vicini, arXiv:1007.1891.